

SITE VISIT DATA SHEET

INSTRUCTIONS: Record observations made during the IU site visit. Provide as much detail as possible.					
Name of industry: Raytheon Vision Systems					
Address of industry: 425 Commerce Court, Lompoc, CA 93436					
Date of visit: 12/7/2017			Time of visit: 10:55 AM		
Name of inspector(s): Julie Moore, City of Lompoc Chuck Durham and Sirese Jacobson, PG Environmental					
Provide the name(s) and title(s) of industry representative(s)					
Name		Title		Phone/Email	
Sal Hernandez		Environmental Health and Safety		Not provided.	
Deb Willem		Production Manager		Not provided.	
IU Permit Number: I-006		Exp. Date: June 30, 2018		IU Classification: 40 CFR 469.18 and 433.17	
Please provide the following documentation:					
1. Nature of operation: The facility conducts photolithography, plating, and etching of silicon wafers for use in optical equipment.					
2. Number of employees	60	Number of shifts:	Not reviewed.	Hours of operation:	Not reviewed.
3. Wastestream flow(s) discharged to the POTW: Wastestreams discharged to the POTW include rinse water from the plating process and wastewater from the chemical mechanical planarization (CMP) machines.					
Sanitary:	Not reviewed.	Process:	30-45 gallons per minute	Combined:	Not reviewed.
4. Describe any current or planned significant changes in process or flow: According to facility representatives, the facility is planning upgrades for summer 2018.					
5. Type of pretreatment system (Describe treatment processes, condition of systems, and deficiencies observed): The facility has a 1,500-gallon holding tanks which collects all process rinses. This tank overflows to a 1,000-gallon tank for pH adjustment and then wastewater flows to a 500-gallon tank for additional pH adjustment. Treated wastewater flows to a final outfall box, which also has a "kill switch" setting; if pH is outside of a specified range, the water is directed back to the initial tank.					
Continuous flow		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Batch		<input type="checkbox"/> Combined	
6. Process area description (identify raw materials and processes used): The facility's process area consists of a shipping and receiving room, a mechanical room, a hazardous waste storage area, chemical and gas bunkers, copper etch lab and a chemical/mechanical polish room.					
7. Chemical storage area (identify the chemicals that are maintained on-site, housekeeping, and storage): The facility has chemical storage bunkers adjacent to the process buildings. These bunkers are individual buildings where the facility stores chemicals separated by compatibility.					
Any floor drains?	No	Any spill control measures?		Spill kit	
8. Are hazardous wastes drummed and labeled? Yes. The facility is a small quantity hazardous waste generator. The facility representatives move hazardous waste from small containers throughout the production area to the main hazardous waste storage area once per week. Clean Harbors picks up the hazardous waste every two months.					
9. Does the IU have hazardous waste manifests? Not reviewed.					

10. Solid waste production and disposal: Rags utilized in the production process are disposed of as hazardous waste.
11. Description of sample location and methods: The sampling points are located at a manhole adjacent to the building and at a point adjacent to the wastewater treatment system.
Notes:
None.

SITE VISIT DATA SHEET

INSTRUCTIONS: Record observations made during the IU site visit. Provide as much detail as possible.					
Name of industry: David's Pinot Vineyard					
Address of industry: 1604 North O Street, Lompoc, CA 93436					
Date of visit: 12/7/2017			Time of visit: 1:15 PM		
Name of inspector(s): Julie Moore, City of Lompoc Sirese Jacobson, PG Environmental					
Provide the name(s) and title(s) of industry representative(s)					
Name		Title		Phone/Email	
Don Schroeder		Winemaker		Not provided.	
IU Permit Number: I-010		Exp. Date: January 28, 2021		IU Classification: Noncategorical SIU	
Please provide the following documentation:					
1. Nature of operation: The facility is involved in wine production, aging, bottling, and shipping. Harvesting and fermentation take place from late August through late October; bottling occurs in April and May.					
2. Number of employees	7	Number of shifts:	1	Hours of operation:	Monday – Friday; 8:00 AM - 4:00 PM
3. Wastestream flow(s) discharged to the POTW: Wastestreams discharged to the POTW include wastewater from washing barrels and floor washes during crush season.					
Sanitary:	Not reviewed.	Process:	10,000 gpd (during peak production)	Combined:	Not reviewed.
4. Describe any current or planned significant changes in process or flow: According to the facility representative, there are no current or planned changes in process or flow.					
5. Type of pretreatment system (Describe treatment processes, condition of systems, and deficiencies observed): The facility's pretreatment system consists of pH adjustment. According to the facility representative, pH adjustment involves adding potassium hydroxide or peracetic acid to the wastewater in the trench to adjust the pH of the wastewater. Wastewater from barrel washing or floor washes is directed to trench drains located in the fermentation room and aging room. The trench drains contain collection baskets to prevent solids from entering the sewer system. From the trench drains, wastewater is sent directly to the City.					
X	Continuous flow	X	Batch		Combined
6. Process area description (identify raw materials and processes used): The production area consists of a fermentation room, an aging room, storage rooms, and a bottling area.					
7. Chemical storage area (identify the chemicals that are maintained on-site, housekeeping, and storage): The facility stores sodium percarbonate, peracetic acid, and potassium hydroxide in a storage room adjacent to the processing room. As noted below, chemicals were not properly stored onsite.					
Any floor drains?	Yes	Any spill control measures?	Spill kit		
8. Are hazardous wastes drummed and labeled? N/A					
9. Does the IU have hazardous waste manifests? N/A					
10. Solid waste production and disposal: The collection baskets under the trench drains collect solids. These collection baskets are emptied every day during production. Solids that contain contaminated yeast are hauled					

offsite by Engel & Gray, Inc.

11. Description of sample location and methods: The sampling point is located at the manhole in the road adjacent to the facility.

Notes:

Finding David's Pinot Vineyard Site Visit – The facility's self-monitoring sampling is not representative of the facility's discharge.

During the site visit, the facility representative explained that if there is no process flow when the contracted lab arrives to collect a sample for the facility's required self-monitoring, a facility representative inserts a hose in one of the facility drains in the fermentation room to generate flow at the sampling point.

Recommendation 5

The Audit Team recommends that the City follow up with the facility representative to ensure that the facility is sampling wastewater that is representative of the facility's discharge.

Finding David's Pinot Vineyard Site Visit - The auditors observed a container of potassium hydroxide stored adjacent to a container of peracetic acid with no secondary containment.

Recommendation 6

The Audit Team recommends that the City follow up with the facility representative to ensure that secondary containment has been installed and that incompatible chemicals have been separated.

Attachment B
Legal Authority Review Checklist

A-[PAGE * MERGEFORMAT]

CHECKLIST – PRETREATMENT PROGRAM LEGAL AUTHORITY REVIEWS

NAME OF POTW: City of Lompoc, CA

DATE OF REVIEW: January 5, 2018

Note: Several changes to the National Pretreatment Regulations made as a result of the Streamlining Rule are more stringent than the previous Federal requirements and therefore are considered required modifications for the POTW. Therefore, to the extent that existing POTW legal authorities are inconsistent with these required changes, they must be revised. Where local authorities are already consistent with these required provisions, further changes are not necessary.

NONE = No revision necessary

REQ = Require Revision

REC = Recommend Revision

	Part 403 Citation	Model SUO Section	REVISIONS			POTW Ordinance Section	Comments / Notes
			NONE	REQ	REC		
A. Definitions [403.3 & 403.8(f)(2)]							
1. Act, Clean Water Act	403.3(b)	§ 1.4 A	X			13.16.030(B)	
2. Authorized or Duly Authorized Representative of the User	403.12(l)	§ 1.4 C	X			13.16.030(B)	
3. Best Management Practices or BMPs	403.3(e)	§ 1.4 E		X			Not defined in section 13.16.030(B).
4. Categorical Pretreatment Standard or Categorical Standard		§ 1.4 F	X			13.16.030(B)	
5. Indirect Discharge or Discharge	403.3(i)	§ 1.4 M	X			13.16.030(B)	
6. Industrial User (or equivalent)	403.3(j)	§ 1.4 LL	X			13.16.030(B)	
7. Interference	403.3(k)	§ 1.4 O	X			13.16.030(B)	
8. National Pretreatment Standard, Pretreatment Standard or Standard	403.3(l)	§ 1.4 BB	X			13.16.030(B)	
9. New Source	403.3(m)	§ 1.4 T		X		13.16.030(B)	The SUO currently references 40 CFR Part 403.3(k) in the definition of “new source”.
10. Pass Through	403.3(p)	§ 1.4 V	X			13.16.030(B)	
11. Pretreatment Requirement	403.3(t)	§ 1.4 AA	X			13.16.030(B)	

A-[PAGE * MERGEFORMAT]

12. Publicly Owned Treatment Works or POTW	403.3(q)	§ 1.4 DD	X			13.16.030(B)	
13. Significant Industrial User <i>[NOTE: §1.4 GG(3) is an optional streamlining provision for Non-Significant Categorical Industrial User classification.]</i>	403.3(v)	§ 1.4 GG	X			13.16.030(B)	
14. Significant Noncompliance	403.8(f)(2)(vii)	§ 9 (A-H)			X	13.16.030(B)	The definition in the City's SUO specifies SNC for exceedances of "daily maximum limit or the average limit". However, the SUO specifies that the local limits are "maximum daily average" and "instantaneous maximum" limits, and does not include average limits.

NONE = No revision necessary

REQ = Require Revision

REC = Recommend Revision

	Part 403 Citation	Model SUO Section	REVISIONS			POTW Ordinance Section	Comments / Notes
			NONE	REQ	REC		
15. Slug Load or Slug Discharge	403.8(f)(2)(vi)	§ 1.4 HH			X	13.16.030(B)	The definition of slug load does not mirror the definition found at 40 CFR 403.8(f)(2)(vi).
16. Other definitions based on terms used in the POTW Ordinance			X			13.16.030B	
B. National Pretreatment Standards – Prohibited Discharges							
1. General Prohibitions							
a. Interference	403.5(a)	§ 2.1A	X			13.16.240(A)	
b. Pass Through	403.5(a)	§ 2.1A	X			13.16.240(A)	
2. Specific Prohibitions [403.5(b)]							
a. Fire/Explosion Hazard (60° C or 140° F flashpoint)	403.5(b)(1)	§ 2.1B(1)		X		13.16.250(A)	The specific prohibition at 13.16.250(A) reads 65 degrees C, instead of 60 degrees C.
b. pH/Corrosion	403.5(b)(2)	§ 2.1B(2)	X			13.16.250(B)	
c. Solid or Viscous/Obstruction	403.5(b)(3)	§ 2.1B(3)	X			13.16.250(C)	
d. Flow Rate/Concentration (BOD, etc.)	403.5(b)(4)	§ 2.1B(4)	X			13.16.240(A)	
e. Heat; exceeds 40° C (104°F)	403.5(b)(5)	§ 2.1B(5)	X			13.16.250(E)	
f. Petroleum/Nonbiodegradable	403.5(b)(6)	§ 2.1B(6)	X			13.16.250(C)	

Cutting/Mineral Oils							
g. Toxic Gases/Vapor/Fumes	403.5(b)(7)	§ 2.1B(7)	X			13.16.250(D)	
h. Trucked/Hauled Waste	403.5(b)(8)	§ 2.1B(8)	X			13.16.270	

NONE = No revision necessary

REQ = Require Revision

REC = Recommend Revision

	Part 403 Citation	Model SUO Section	REVISIONS			POTW Ordinance Section	Comments / Notes
			NONE	REQ	REC		
3. National Categorical Standards	403.8(f)(1)(ii)	§ 2.2	X			13.16.130	
4. Local Limits Development <i>[NOTE: POTWs may develop Best Management Practices (BMPs) to implement the prohibitions listed in 40 CFR 403.5(a)(1). Such BMPs shall be considered local limits and Pretreatment Standards.]</i>	403.5(c) & (d)	§ 2.4	X			13.16.340	
5. Prohibition Against Dilution as Treatment	403.6(d)	§ 2.6	X			13.16.330	
6. Best Management Practices Development <i>[NOTE: Optional streamlining provision.]</i>	403.5(c)(4)	§ 2.4C	X				
C. Control Discharges to POTW System							
1. Deny/Condition New or Increased Contributions	403.8(f)(1)(i)	§§ 4.8 & 5.2		X		13.16.180	Missing from the SUO.
2. Individual Control Mechanism (e.g., permit) to ensure compliance - <i>Permit Content</i>	403.8(f)(1)(iii)	§ 4.2	X			13.16.180	
a. Statement of Duration	403.8(f)(1)(B)(1)	§§ 5.1 & 5.2A(1)	X			13.16.210	
b. Statement of Nontransferability	403.8(f)(1)(B)(2)	§5.2A(2)	X			13.16.200	
c. Effluent Limits	403.8(f)(1)(B)(3)	§ 5.2A(3)	X			13.16.180	

NONE = No revision necessary

REQ = Require Revision

REC = Recommend Revision

	Part 403 Citation	Model SUO Section	REVISIONS			POTW Ordinance Section	Comments / Notes
			NONE	REQ	REC		
d. Best Management Practices <i>[Note: This is a required streamlining provision for CIUs with BMP requirements as part of its Categorical Standards. But if BMPs are being applied to other CIUs or noncategorical SIUs without categorical BMP requirements, then this provision would be optional and is only required if the POTW has incorporated the use of BMPs (§ 2.4 C).]</i>	403.8(f)(1)(B)(3)	§ 5.2A(3)	X				
e. Self-Monitoring Requirements	403.8(f)(1)(B)(4)	§ 5.2A(4)	X			13.16.180(A) & (D)	
f. Reporting & Notification Requirements	403.8(f)(1)(B)(4)	§ 5.2A(4)	X			13.16.180(D)	
g. Recordkeeping Requirements	403.8(f)(1)(B)(4)	§ 5.2A(4)	X			13.16.180(E)	
h. Process for Seeking a Waiver for Pollutants Not Present or Expected to be Present <i>[NOTE: Optional streamlining provision. Required only if the POTW has incorporated § 6.4B of the Model SUO.]</i>	403.8(f)(1)(B)(4) & 403.12(e)(2)	§ 5.2A(5)	X				N/A. The City did not adopt this optional streamlining provision.
i. Statement of Applicable Civil and Criminal Penalties	403.8(f)(1)(B)(5)	§ 5.2A(6)	X			13.16.470(B) & (C)	
j. Slug Discharge Requirements (if necessary) <i>[NOTE: Required streamlining change. Where the POTW has determined that slug controls are necessary, the ordinance must provide authority for the POTW to include such requirements in IU permits.]</i>	403.8(f)(1)(iii)(B)(6)	§ 5.2A(7)		X		13.16.250(F)	According to section 13.16.250(F), slug loads are prohibited; however, the SUO does not provide authority to include slug discharge control plan requirements in IU permits.

NONE = No revision necessary

REQ = Require Revision

REC = Recommend Revision

	Part 403 Citation	Model SUO Section	REVISIONS			POTW Ordinance Section	Comments / Notes
			NONE	REQ	REC		
k. Specific waived pollutant <i>[NOTE: Optional streamlining provision. Required only if the POTW has incorporated § 6.4B of the Model SUO.]</i>	403.8(f)(1)(B) (4)	§ 5.2A(8)	X				N/A. The City did not adopt this optional streamlining provision.
l. Permit Application/Reapplication Requirements <i>[Note: Optional permit provision]</i>		§§ 5.3 & 5.7	X			13.16.170 & 13.16.210	Not reviewed.
m. Permit Modification <i>[Note: Optional permit provision]</i>		§ 5.4	X			13.16.190	Not reviewed.
n. Permit Revocation/Termination <i>[Note: Optional permit provision]</i>		§§ 5.6 & 10.8	X			13.16.230	Not reviewed.
o. Proper Operation and Maintenance <i>[Note: Optional permit provision]</i>		§ 3.1	X				Not reviewed.
p. Duty of Halt/Reduce <i>[Note: Optional permit provision]</i>		§ 10.7	X			13.16.430(B)	Not reviewed.
q. Requirement to submit Chain-of-Custody forms with monitoring data <i>[Note: Optional permit provision]</i>			X				Not reviewed.
3. General Control Mechanism to ensure compliance <i>[NOTE: Optional streamlining provision. Required only if the POTW has incorporated the use of General Permits (§ 4.6 of the Model SUO).]</i> - Permit Content	403.8(f)(1)(iii) (A)	§ 4.2 & 4.6	X				N/A. The City does not issue general control mechanisms.
a. Statement of Duration	403.8(f)(1)(B) (1)	§§ 5.1 & 5.2A(1)	X			13.16.210	N/A
b. Statement of Nontransferability	403.8(f)(1)(B) (2)	§ 5.2A(2)	X			13.16.200	N/A

NONE = No revision necessary

REQ = Require Revision

REC = Recommend Revision

	Part 403 Citation	Model SUO Section	REVISIONS			POTW Ordinance Section	Comments / Notes
			NONE	REQ	REC		
c. Effluent Limits	403.8(f)(1)(B) (3)	§ 5.2A(3)	X			13.16.180	N/A
d. Best Management Practices <i>[Note: This is a required streamlining provision for CIUs with BMP requirements as part of its Categorical Standards. But if BMPs are being applied to other CIUs or noncategorical SIUs without categorical BMP requirements, then this provision would be optional and is only required if the POTW has incorporated the use of BMPs (§ 2.4C).]</i>	403.8(f)(1)(B) (3)	§ 5.2A(3)	X				N/A
e. Self-Monitoring Requirements	403.8(f)(1)(B) (4)	§ 5.2A(4)	X			13.16.180D	N/A
f. Reporting & Notification Requirements	403.8(f)(1)(B) (4)	§ 5.2A(4)	X			13.16.180D &H	N/A
g. Recordkeeping Requirements	403.8(f)(1)(B) (4)	§ 5.2A(4)	X			13.16.180E	N/A
h. Process for Seeking a Waiver for Pollutants Not Present or Expected to be Present <i>[Note: Required only if POTW has incorporated the use of Pollutants Not Present and § 6.4 of the Model SUO.]</i>	403.8(f)(1)(B) (4) & 403.12(e) (2)	§ 5.2A(5)	X				N/A
i. Statement of Applicable Civil and Criminal Penalties	403.8(f)(1)(B) (5)	§ 5.2A(7)	X			13.16.470	N/A

NONE = No revision necessary

REQ = Require Revision

REC = Recommend Revision

	Part 403 Citation	Model SUO Section	REVISIONS			POTW Ordinance Section	Comments / Notes
			NONE	REQ	REC		
j. Slug Discharge Requirements (if necessary) <i>[NOTE: Required streamlining change. The ordinance should indicate that a user is required to develop a slug discharge control plan if determined by the POTW to be necessary.]</i>	403.8(f)(1)(B)(6)	§ 5.2A(8)	X			13.16.250F	N/A
k. Permit Application/Reapplication Requirements <i>[Note: Optional permit provision]</i>		§§ 5.3 & 5.7	X			13.16.170 & 13.16.210	N/A
l. Permit Modification <i>[Note: Optional permit provision]</i>		§ 5.4	X			13.16.190	N/A
m. Permit Revocation/Termination <i>[Note: Optional permit provision]</i>		§§ 5.6 & 10.8	X			13.16.230	N/A
n. Proper Operation and Maintenance <i>[Note: Optional permit provision]</i>		§ 3.1	X			13.16.350	N/A
o. Duty of Halt/Reduce <i>[Note: Optional permit provision]</i>		§ 10.7	X			13.16.430(B)	N/A
p. Requirement to submit Chain-of-Custody forms with monitoring data <i>[Note: Optional permit provision]</i>			X				N/A
D. Required Reports							
1. Develop compliance schedule for installation of technology	403.8(f)(1)(iv)	§§ 5.2b(2) & 10.4	X			13.16.170(1)(f)	

NONE = No revision necessary

REQ = Require Revision

REC = Recommend Revision

	Part 403 Citation	Model SUO Section	REVISIONS			POTW Ordinance Section	Comments / Notes
			NONE	REQ	REC		
2. Reporting Requirements [403.12] <i>Types of Reports</i>							
a. Baseline monitoring report	403.12(b)	§ 6.1			X	13.16.170 (A)	Section 13.16.170(A) of the City's SUO uses the term "baseline report" which may be confused with the baseline reports required for CIUs by 40 CFR 403.12(b).
(i) Identifying Information	403.12(b)(1)	§ 6.1B(1) & § 4.5A(1)a	X			13.16.170 (A)(1)(a) (i-iii)	
(ii) Other Environmental Permits Held	403.12(b)(2)	§§ 6.1B(1) & 4.5A(2)	X			13.16.170 (A)(1)(d)	
(iii) Description of operations	403.12(b)(3)	§§ 6.1B(1) & 4.5A(3)a	X			13.16.170 (A)(1)(b)	
(iv) Flow measurements	403.12(b)(4)	§§ 6.1(b)(2) & 4.5A(6)	X			13.16.170 (A)(1)(g)(i)	
(v) Measurement of pollutants	403.12(b)(5)	§ 6.1B(2)	X			13.16.170A(1)(g)(ii)	

(vi) Certification	403.12(b)(6)	§ 6.1B(3)	X			13.16.170A(1)(e)	
(vii) Compliance schedule	403.12(b)(7)	§ 6.1B(4)	X			13.16.170A(1)(f)	
b. Compliance schedule progress report	403.12(c)	§ 6.2		X		13.16.170(A)(1)(f)	Section 13.16.170(A)(1)(f) includes requirements for compliance schedules, but does not require submittal of a compliance schedule progress report.
c. Report on compliance with categorical Pretreatment Standard deadline	403.12(d)	§ 6.3	X			13.16.170(A)((2)(b)	
d. Periodic reports on continued compliance							
- From categorical users	403.12(e)	§ 6.4A		X			Not included in the SUO.
- From significant non-categorical users	403.12(h)	§ 6.4A		X			Not included in the SUO.
e. Notice of potential problems to be reported immediately (including slug loads)	403.12(f)	§ 6.6		X			Not included in the SUO.

NONE = No revision necessary

REQ = Require Revision

REC = Recommend Revision

	Part 403 Citation	Model SUO Section	REVISIONS			POTW Ordinance Section	Comments / Notes
			NONE	REQ	REC		
f. Notification of changes affecting potential for a slug discharge <i>[NOTE: Required streamlining revision]</i>	403.8(f)(2)(vi)	§ § 6.5 & 6.6		X			Not included in the SUO.
g. Notice of violation/sampling requirement <i>[NOTE: Required streamlining revision.]</i>	403.12(g)(2)	§ 6.8		X			Not included in SUO.
h. Requirement to conduct representative sampling	403.12(g)(3)	§ 6.4E		X			The City's SUO does not require user to submit periodic reports and therefore, does not require samples to be representative of the discharge.
i. Notification of changed discharge	403.12(j)	§ 6.5	X			13.16.180 (F)	
j. Notification of discharge of hazardous waste	403.12(p)	§ 6.9		X		13.16.180 (H)	The SUO does not adequately specify what should be included in the notice.
<i>Other Reporting Requirements</i>							
k. Data accuracy certification & authorized signatory	403.6(a)(2)(ii) & 403.12(l)	§§ 6.4D & 6.14		X			Not included in the SUO.
l. Recordkeeping Requirement (3 years or longer)	403.12(o)	§ 6.13		X		13.16.180 (E)	The SUO does not specify that records must be retained for at least three years.
- Including documentation associated with Best Management Practices <i>[NOTE: Required streamlining provision.]</i>	403.12(o)	§ 6.13	X				N/A

m. Submission of all monitoring data <i>[NOTE: Required streamlining revision]</i>	403.12(g)(6)	§ 6.4F		X			Not included in the SUO.
n. Annual certification by Non-significant categorical Industrial Users <i>[Note: Optional provision, required only if the POTW has incorporated §1.4GG(3) of the Model SUO.]</i>	403.3(v)(2)	§§ 4.7C & 6.14B	X				N/A

NONE = No revision necessary

REQ = Require Revision

REC = Recommend Revision

	Part 403 Citation	Model SUO Section	REVISIONS			POTW Ordinance Section	Comments / Notes
			NONE	REQ	REC		
o. Certification of pollutant not present <i>[NOTE: Optional provision, required only if the POTW has incorporated § 6.4 B of the Model SUO]</i>	403.12(e)(2)(v)	§ 6.14C	X				N/A
E. Test Procedures [40 CFR Part 136 & 403.12(g)]							
1. Analytical procedures (40 CFR Part 136) <i>[NOTE: Required streamlining provisions]</i>	403.12(g)	§ 6.10	X			13.16.100	
2. Sample collection procedures <i>[NOTE: Required streamlining provisions]</i>	403.12(g)(3) & (4)	§ 6.11	X			13.16.100	
F. Inspection and Monitoring Procedures [403.8(f)]							
1. Right to enter all parts of the facility at reasonable times	403.8(f)(1)(v)	§ 7.1	X			13.16.090	
2. Right to inspect generally for compliance	403.8(f)(1)(v)	§ 7.1	X			13.16.090	
3. Right to take independent samples	403.8(f)(1)(v), 403.8(f)(2)(v) & 403.8(f)(2)(vii)	§ 7.1	X				
4. Right to require installation of monitoring Equipment	403.8(f)(1)(iv)	§ 7.1	X			13.16.180	
5. Right to inspect and copy records	403.12(o)(2)	§ 7.1	X			13.16.090	
G. Remedies for Non-compliance (Enforcement) [403.8(f)(1)(vi)]							
1. Non-emergency response							
a. Injunctive relief	403.8(f)(1)(vi)	§ 11.1	X				
b. Civil/Criminal penalties	403.8(f)(1)(vi)	§§ 11.2 & 11.3	X			13.16.470	

NONE = No revision necessary

REQ = Require Revision

REC = Recommend Revision

	Part 403 Citation	Model SUO Section	REVISIONS			POTW Ordinance Section	Comments / Notes
			NONE	REQ	REC		
2. Emergency response							
a. Immediately halt actual/threatened discharged	403.8(f)(1)(vi) (B)	§ 10.7	X			13.16.430	
3. Legal authority to enforce Enforcement Response Plan	403.8(f)(1)(vi)	§ 11.4		X			Not included in the SUO.
H. Public Participation							
1. Publish list of Industrial Users in Significant Noncompliance <i>[NOTE: Required streamlining revision]</i>	403.8(f)(2)(viii)	§ 9	X			13.16.440	
2. Access to data [403.8(f)(1)(vii) & 403.14]							
a. Government	403.14(a) & (c)	§ 8	X			13.16.110	
b. Public	403.14(b)	§ 8	X			13.16.110	
I. Optional Provisions							
1. Net/Gross adjustments <i>[streamlining provision]</i>	403.15	§ 2.2 D	X				N/A
2. Equivalent mass limits for concentration Limits <i>[streamlining provision]</i>	403.6(c)	§ 2.2 E	X				N/A
3. Equivalent concentration limits for mass limits <i>[streamlining provision]</i>	403.6(c)	§ 2.2 F	X				N/A
4. Upset Notification	403.16	§ 13.1	X				N/A
5. Waive monitoring for pollutant not present or expected to the present <i>[streamlining provision]</i>	403.12(e)(2)	§ 6.4B	X				N/A
6. Reduce periodic compliance reporting <i>[streamlining provision]</i>	403.12(e)(3)	§ 6.4C	X				N/A
7. Other special agreement or waivers (excluding waiver of National Categorical Pretreatment Standards and Requirements)			X			13.16.150	N/A

NONE = No revision necessary

REQ = Require Revision

REC = Recommend Revision

	Part 403 Citation	Model SUO Section	REVISIONS			POTW Ordinance Section	Comments / Notes
			NONE	REQ	REC		
8. Hauled Waste Reporting/Requirements		§ 3.4	X			13.16.270	
9. Grease Interceptor Reporting/Requirements		§ 3.2 C	X			13.16.370	
10. Authority to issue Notice of Violations (NOVs)		§ 10.1	X			13.16.480	
11. Authority to issue Administrative Orders (AOs)			X				
12. Authority to issue Administrative Penalties		§ 10.6	X			13.16.450	
13. Authority to enforce again falsification or tampering			X			13.16.470(C).2.d	
14. Any other supplemental enforcement actions as noted in the POTW's enforcement response plan			X				
15. Permit Appeals Procedures			X			13.16.140	
16. Penalty or Enforcement Appeals Procedures			X			13.16.140	
17. Bypass Notification	403.17	§ 13.3	X			Permit according to 40CFR403.17(c)	

Document(s) submitted for review:

Chapter 13.16 Sewer System

Name of Reviewers

Sirese Jacobson

Attachment B

Example PCI Report

Pretreatment Compliance Inspection

Summary Report

Discharger: City of Santa Barbara
NPDES Permit No. CA0048143
Santa Barbara County

Location: 520 East Yanonali Street, Santa Barbara, CA 93103

Contact: Gaylen Fair, Laboratory Supervisor
Mary Thompson, Laboratory Analyst Coordinator/Industrial Waste
Pretreatment

Inspection Date: December 6, 2017

Inspected By: Chuck Durham, PG Environmental
Sirese Jacobson, PG Environmental

Attachments

Attachment A Industrial User Site Visit Data Sheets

B-[PAGE * MERGEFORMAT]

I. Inspection Summary

Upon arrival, EPA Contractors Chuck Durham and Sirese Jacobson (referred to as the Inspection Team) met with the City of Santa Barbara's (City's) contacts, Gaylen Fair and Mary Thompson (jointly referred to as City representatives). The Inspection Team discussed the purpose and format of the inspection and interviewed the facility contacts about the City's pretreatment program.

As part of the inspection, the Inspection Team reviewed the files and conducted inspections at the following facilities:

- MarBorg Industries (MarBorg; non-categorical significant industrial user [SIU])
- Corning Technology Center – Santa Barbara (Corning; categorical industrial user [CIU] subject to 40 CFR 469.18, Semiconductor subcategory, pretreatment standards for new sources*)

The last assessment of the City's pretreatment program was a pretreatment compliance inspection (PCI) performed on June 2, 2014.

* The City currently permitted Corning as a CIU subject to the categorical pretreatment regulations at both 40 CFR 469.18 and 433.17, Metal Finishing; however, based on the processes observed at the facility during the inspection and the language found in the federal regulations at 40 CFR 433.10, only the categorical pretreatment regulations at 40 CFR 469.18 apply to this facility. Refer to the Corning site visit data sheet (SVDS) provided in Attachment A for additional information.

II. Program Description

The City owns and operates the El Estero Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP) which serves the City of Santa Barbara and unincorporated portions of Santa Barbara County. At the time of the inspection, the population of the service area included approximately 100,000 individuals. The WWTP has a design capacity of 8 million gallons per day (MGD) and provides primary, secondary treatment, as well as tertiary treatment for recycled water.

III. Industrial User (IU) Characterization

IUs currently identified by the Control Authority (CA)	IU Type
12	Discharging Significant Industrial Users
11	Discharging Non-Categorical SIUs (as defined by the CA)
1	Categorical Industrial Users (CIUs)
0	Middle Tier CIUs
1	Zero-Discharging CIUs
Not applicable (N/A)	Non-significant CIU (NSCIU)
3	Other Regulated IUs (e.g. permitted IUs) Describe: Cutler's Artisan Spirits and two groundwater remediation sites (monitor for benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene, and xylene; total petroleum hydrocarbons)
1	Waste Haulers Describe: MarBorg hauls grease waste directly to the digester at the City's WWTP.

IV. Findings Summary Table		
Part V Section Reference – Finding	Requirement(s)	Recommendation(s)
C.4.a - The SIU fact sheets could include more information.		1
C.4.b - The permits reviewed do not clearly state the sample type for all regulated parameters.	1	
C.4.c - The Corning permit states that the facility is responsible for monitoring its discharge and is required to conduct resampling.	2	
C.4.d - The permits do not contain adequate resampling requirements in the event of a discharge violation.		2
C.4.e - The permits reviewed do not require the facility to notify the City of changes affecting the potential for a slug discharge.	3	
C.4.f - Neither of the permits reviewed specify that the facility is required to have a slug discharge control plan.	4	
C.4.g - The Corning permit does not state the applicable pretreatment category.	5	3
C.4.h - The Corning permit incorrectly identifies the “end-of-pipe” sampling point as outfall 001.	6	
C.4.i - Table 3 in the Corning permit contains superscripts but is missing the corresponding footnotes.	7	
C.4.j - The Corning permit does not include all applicable categorical limits and monitoring requirements.	8	
E.1 - The City failed to monitor for all regulated pollutants at its SIUs.	9	
F.1.a - The City did not take enforcement action for failure of an SIU to notify the City with 24 hours of becoming aware of a violation.	10	
F.1.b - The City did not take enforcement action for late reporting.	11	

V. Evaluation

The Inspection Team discussed the following topics regarding the City's pretreatment program with the City representatives. The Inspection Team also reviewed SIU files to assess the retention and maintenance of required program documents and to generally evaluate overall program implementation. The following sections describe program deficiencies and areas of concern identified during the inspection process along with requirements, recommendations, and associated references to 40 CFR Part 403.

A. Control Authority (CA) Pretreatment Program Modification

1. When was the last program modification? Did the CA notify the EPA of program modifications? (40 CFR 403.18)

The City has not made substantial changes to the pretreatment program since the last PCI. However, the City made non-substantial revisions to its enforcement response plan (ERP) in October 2014 and appropriately notified the Approval Authority. The City is also in the process of conducting a local limits evaluation. The City has completed sampling and is waiting to proceed with the study until the modifications to the secondary treatment system at the WWTP are completed (the City is switching from carbonaceous treatment to nitrification; the project is expected to be complete in the summer of 2018).

The City is reminded that modifications to the pretreatment program shall be submitted to the Approval Authority in accordance with the federal regulation at 40 CFR 403.18.

B. IU Characterization

1. Describe the CA's procedure for identifying and locating IUs that might be subject to the pretreatment program. Has the CA identified and located all applicable IUs (non-categorical SIUs, CIUs, NSCIUs, etc.)? (40 CFR 403.8(f)(2)(i))

The City's appears to have adequate procedures for identifying and locating industrial users subject to the pretreatment program. The City appears to also have identified applicable industrial users in the service area at the time of the inspection. The City receives the business license listing monthly, conducts internet searches and drive-by inspections of facilities, and reviews water usage records.

Joe's Plating voluntarily closed on November 22, 2017 due to compliance issues with the new air regulations and the Certified Unified Program Agency (CUPA) requirements. The City is working on a close-out evaluation of the facility with the owner. The Inspection Team recommends that the City coordinate with CUPA and continue its follow-up oversight at the facility to ensure that all equipment and materials have been properly removed.

2. Has the CA identified the character and volume of pollutants contributed to the publicly owned treatment works (POTW) by IUs subject to the pretreatment program?
(40 CFR 403.8(f)(2)(ii))

The City appears to have adequate knowledge regarding the character and volume of pollutants discharged to the WWTP by industrial dischargers currently regulated by the City. The City conducts inspections semi-annually and collects samples quarterly at its SIUs.

3. Has the CA prepared and maintained a list of SIUs, as defined in 403.3(v)(1), along with the applicable SIU criteria? Does the list indicate whether the CA has made a determination that an SIU is a NSCIU, as defined in 403.3(v)(2), rather than an SIU? Have modifications to the list been submitted with annual reports?
(40 CFR 403.8(f)(6))

Yes, the City maintains a current list of SIUs and also provides this list to the Approval Authority in the annual pretreatment program report. The list included in the City's 2016 annual report provides the business name, address, type of operation, and whether the industrial user is a CIU, non-categorical industrial user, groundwater discharger, or a direct discharger. The report also includes a list of discontinued permittees since the last annual report.

The City does not have the legal authority to designate or permit SIUs as NSCIUs.

C. Control Mechanism Evaluation

1. Has the CA issued individual or general control mechanisms to all SIUs?
(40 CFR 403.8(f)(1)(iii))

All SIUs whose files were reviewed during the inspection had been issued an individual permit and all permits were current. The City did not issue general control mechanisms at the time of the inspection.

2. Do the applications for general control mechanism contain all of the following?
(40 CFR 403.8(f)(1)(iii)(A)(2))

- a. Contact info
- b. Production processes
- c. Types of wastes generated
- d. Location for monitoring
- e. Any request for waiver for pollutants not present per 40 CFR 403.12(e)(2)

N/A. The City does not issue general control mechanisms.

3. Are general control mechanisms only issued for IUs where all of the following is true?
(40 CFR 403.8(f)(1)(iii)(A)(1))

- a. Involve same/substantially similar types of operations
- b. Discharge the same type of waste
- c. Same effluent limitations
- d. Same or similar monitoring
- e. There are no CIU production-based standards, CIU mass limits, combined wastestream formula, or net/gross calculations

N/A. The City does not issue general control mechanisms.

4. Do both individual and general control mechanisms include the following, where applicable?
(40 CFR 403.8(f)(1)(iii)(B))

- a. Statement of duration (5 years max)
- b. Statement of non-transferability
- c. Applicable effluent limits (local limits, categorical standards, BMPs)
- d. Self-monitoring requirements
 - Identification of pollutants to be monitored
 - Sampling frequency
 - Sampling locations/discharge points
 - Appropriate sample types
 - Reporting requirements
 - Record-keeping requirements
- e. Statement of applicable civil and criminal penalties
- f. Compliance schedules
- g. Notice of slug loading or potential problems at POTW

- h. Notification of spills, bypasses, upsets, etc.
- i. Notification of significant change in discharge
- j. 24-hour notification of effluent violation
- k. Submit resampling results within 30-days
- l. Slug discharge control plan requirement, if required by POTW
- m. Certification statements
- n. Sampling/analysis requirements (Part 136 or alternative)
- o. Reporting of additional sampling
- p. 90-day compliance report

The Inspection Team reviewed the files, including the applicable permits, for two of the City's SIUs, MarBorg and Corning. Many, but not all of the above permit elements were included in the permits. Findings regarding permit conditions are listed below.

The City has a separate *Standard Conditions* document that is attached to permits issued to its SIUs. However, the *Standard Conditions* document was not included in the SIU files maintained onsite. Upon request, the Inspection Team was provided a copy of the *Standard Conditions*, which contained some of the individual control mechanism requirements.

Finding C.4.a – The SIU fact sheets could include more information.

The City has developed fact sheets for its SIUs. The fact sheets contain the following information: general contact information, sampling frequency, sampling location, and reporting requirements.

Recommendation 1

It is recommended that the fact sheets include additional information, such as recent changes and violations, information from the last inspection, and details on the applicable facility's process. For CIUs, it is recommended that the City include the applicable federal category subpart in the fact sheet.

Finding C.4.b – The permits reviewed do not clearly state the sample type for all regulated parameters.

The MarBorg and Corning permits list the sample type for parameters to be sampled, including total suspended solids (TSS), arsenic, cadmium, chromium, copper, lead, mercury, molybdenum, nickel, selenium, silver, and zinc as "Composite/Grab". The Corning permit also lists the sample type for biochemical oxygen demand (BOD) as "Composite/Grab". The required sample type for these pollutants, per 40 CFR 403.12(g)(3), should be 24-hour flow-proportional composite samples unless the City has determined that flow-proportional composite samples are not feasible for the SIU and that grab samples are representative of the SIU's discharge.

Regulatory Requirements

The federal regulations at 40 CFR 403.8(f)(1)(B)(4) requires permits to include self-monitoring, sampling, reporting, notification and recordkeeping requirements, including sample type.

The federal regulations at 40 CFR 403.12(g)(3) specify that, "[g]rab samples must be used for pH, cyanide, total phenols, oil and grease, sulfide, and volatile organic compounds. For all other pollutants, 24-hour composite samples must be obtained through flow-proportional composite sampling

techniques, unless time-proportional composite sampling or grab sampling is authorized by the Control Authority. Where time-proportional composite sampling or grab sampling is authorized by the Control Authority, the samples must be representative of the Discharge and the decision to allow the alternative sampling must be documented in the Industrial User file for that facility or facilities.”

Requirement 1

The City is required to revise the permits to include the correct sample types for all regulated pollutants. If it is not possible to collect flow-proportional composite samples, the City is also required to document in the SIU file the rationale for collecting grab or time-proportional composite samples in lieu of flow-proportional composite samples.

Finding C.4.c – The Corning permit states that the facility is responsible for monitoring its discharge and is required to conduct resampling.

The Corning permit specifies that the facility is required to monitor its discharge and if monitoring indicates a violation of an effluent limit, “[t]he permittee is responsible for conducting re-sampling for that analyte within thirty (30) days of becoming aware of that violation.” However, based on the file review and discussion with City representatives, the City is conducting monitoring in lieu of requiring self-monitoring from its SIUs and therefore the City should collect the resample in the event that monitoring indicates a violation.

Regulatory Requirements

The federal regulations at 40 CFR 403.8(f)(1)(B)(4) requires permits to include self-monitoring, sampling, reporting, notification and recordkeeping requirements.

The federal regulations at 40 CFR 403.12(g)(2) requires the SIUs to notify the control authority within 24 hours of becoming aware of violations and to resample and submit results of the resample within 30 days of becoming aware of the violation.

Requirement 2

Because the City is conducting monitoring in lieu of requiring the SIUs to self-monitor, the City is required to revise the Corning permit to remove any language explicitly requiring the facility to conduct self-monitoring. The permit should also contain self-monitoring requirements in the event that the City requires Corning to conduct self-monitoring in the future, similar to the language at Part 4.B in the MarBorg permit.

Finding C.4.d – The permits do not contain adequate resampling requirements in the event of a discharge violation.

Although the City conducts monitoring on behalf of requiring its SIUs to perform self-monitoring, both permits reviewed contain resampling requirements for the facility in the event that an effluent limit violation occurs. However, the resampling requirements do not require submittal of resampling results to the City within 30 days of becoming aware of the violation.

The Marborg permit specifies that the facility is not required to conduct self-monitoring at this time but that they may be required to do so in the future. However, the permit states that upon a violation, the

facility “is responsible for conducting re-sampling for that analyte within thirty (30) days of becoming aware of that violation.”

Although the City performs self-monitoring in lieu of requiring its SIUs to do so, the Corning permit requires the facility to conduct resampling within thirty days of becoming aware of the violation but does not require resampling results to be submitted to the City within 30 days of becoming aware of the violation.

Regulatory Requirements

N/A.

Recommendation 2

It is recommended that the City revise the permits to clearly identify resampling requirements in the event that the SIU is required to conduct self-monitoring. Specifically, the permit should state that the facility is required to conduct resampling and submit results to the City within 30 days of becoming aware of the violation.

Finding C.4.e – The permits reviewed do not require the facility to notify the City of changes affecting the potential for a slug discharge.

Regulatory Requirement

The federal regulations at 40 CFR 403.8(f)(2)(vi) require SIUs to notify the control authority immediately of any changes at its facility affecting the potential for a slug discharge.

Requirement 3

The City is required to revise the permits to include the requirement for each permittee to notify the City of changes affecting the facility’s potential for a slug discharge.

Finding C.4.f – Neither of the permits reviewed specify that the facility is required to have a slug discharge control plan.

During the interview portion of the PCI, the City representatives stated that both MarBorg and Corning are required to have slug discharge control plans. However, the permits for these facilities did not require them to have slug discharge control plans.

Regulatory Requirement

The federal regulations at 40 CFR 403.8(f)(1)(iii)(B)(6) requires control authorities to include requirements to control slug discharges in SIU permits, if the POTW has determined that a plan is necessary.

Requirement 4

The City is required to revise the permits to include the requirement for facilities to develop and implement a plan to control slug discharges if a plan is determined by the POTW to be necessary.

Finding C.4.g – The Corning permit does not state the applicable pretreatment category.

The fact sheet for Corning currently states that the facility is subject to the federal pretreatment standards at “40 CFR Part 469; 433”. However, the Corning permit does not specify which federal category of pretreatment standards applies to the facility.

Regulatory Requirements

The federal regulations at 40 CFR 403.8(f)(2)(iii) require control authorities to notify industrial users of applicable pretreatment standards.

The federal regulations at 40 CFR 403.8(f)(1)(iii)(B)(3) require permits to include effluent limits based on applicable general pretreatment standards, categorical pretreatment standards, local limits, and state and local law.

Requirement 5

The City is required to revise the Corning permit to specify the facility’s applicable federal pretreatment category and whether or not the facility is a new or existing source.

Recommendation 3

Based on the processes observed at the facility during the site visit and the language included in the federal regulations at 40 CFR 433.10, the facility is only subject to the categorical pretreatment standards at 40 CFR 469.18 (Semiconductor subcategory, pretreatment standards for new sources). It is recommended that the City revise the fact sheet to specify the subpart to indicate which categorical standards (i.e. 40 CFR 469.18) are applicable to the facility.

Finding C.4.h – The Corning permit incorrectly identifies the “end-of-pipe” sampling point as outfall 001.

Part 2.A of the Corning permit incorrectly identifies outfall 001 as the end-of-pipe sampling point. Outfall 002 is actually the end-of-pipe sampling point, while outfall 001 is the end-of-process sampling point.

Regulatory Requirements

The federal regulations at 40 CFR 403.8(f)(1)(B)(4) require SIU permits to specify the sampling location.

Requirement 6

The City is required to revise the Corning permit to clearly identify the sampling location.

Finding C.4.i – Table 3 in the Corning permit contains superscripts but is missing the corresponding footnotes.

Table 3, *Sampling Requirements for Connection 001*, in the Corning permit includes superscripts ⁽¹⁾ and ⁽²⁾, but does not include the corresponding footnotes below the table. The sampling requirements table in the MarBorg permit contains the same superscripts and includes the following footnotes:

(1) For composite samples, if possible, flow-proportional composite samples should be taken unless

time-proportional composite or grab samples are authorized by the Public Works Director. Grab samples should be taken within a fifteen-minute interval. For Comp/Grab, either composite or grab sampling techniques may be use.

- (2) *The concentration of Oil and Grease shall be determined by summing the concentration of polar (vegetable/animal) and non-polar (mineral/petroleum) oil and grease.*

Regulatory Requirements

The federal regulations 40 CFR 403.8(f)(1)(B)(4) require SIU control mechanisms to include, “Self-monitoring, sampling, reporting, notification and recordkeeping requirements, including an identification of the pollutants to be monitored, sampling location, sampling frequency, and sample type, based on the applicable general Pretreatment Standards in part 403 of this chapter, categorical Pretreatment Standards, local limits, and State and local law.”

Requirement 7

The City is required to revise the Corning permit to include the appropriate footnotes to provide necessary information with regard to sampling requirements.

Finding C.4.j – The Corning permit does not include all applicable categorical limits and monitoring requirements.

The Corning fact sheet states that the facility is required to monitor for total toxic organics (TTOs) and fluoride annually. However, the permit does not require the facility to monitor for TTOs, the only 40 CFR 469.18-regulated parameter.

Regulatory Requirements

The federal regulations at 40 CFR 403.8(f)(1)(iii)(B)(3) requires permits to include effluent limits based on applicable general pretreatment standards, categorical pretreatment standards, local limits, and state and local law.

Requirement 8

The City is required to revise the Corning permit to include all applicable categorical standards and monitoring requirements. The City must revise the Corning permit and fact sheet to require the facility to monitor for TTOs semi-annually.

D. Application of Pretreatment Standards and Requirements

1. Does the CA apply all applicable pretreatment standards? (40 CFR 403.8(f)(1)(ii) and 403.8(5))

No, based on the files reviewed, the City has not applied all applicable pretreatment standards to its SIUs. As described in Finding C.4.j, the Corning permit does not require the facility to monitor for TTOs, a pollutant regulated under 40 CFR 469.18.

In addition, Table 3 (Monitoring Requirements) in the Corning permit requires the facility to monitor for fluoride; however, fluoride is a federally regulated pollutant under 40 CFR 469.17 for direct dischargers and does not apply to indirect dischargers.

2. Has the CA evaluated the need for SIUs to develop slug discharge control plans?
(40 CFR 403.8(f)(2)(vi))

Yes. According to the City representatives, all SIUs have been evaluated for the need to develop slug discharge control plans. Currently, the City requires four SIUs: MarBorg, Mission Linen #1, Mission Linen #4, and Corning, to have slug discharge control plans. During SIU annual inspections, the City determines whether a slug discharge control plan is needed for the SIU and if so, whether the plan is on file.

E. Compliance Monitoring

1. Has the CA inspected and independently sampled each SIU at least once a year? Middle tier CIUs at least once every two years? Sample once during term of CIU control mechanism if CIU sampling waived for pollutants not present?
(40 CFR 403.8(f)(2)(v), 403.12(e)(2), 403.12(e)(2))

According to City representatives, per the City's approved pretreatment program, it is required to conduct inspections at its SIUs twice per year and conduct compliance sampling quarterly. Based on the files reviewed, the City has been conducting inspections and sampling in accordance with its approved program, with the exception described below.

Finding E.1 – The City failed to monitor for all regulated pollutants at its SIUs.

The Corning file did not include analysis for cyanide in 2017. The permit requires annual monitoring for cyanide. Furthermore, according to the City, Corning is subject to federal pretreatment standards at 40 CFR 433.17, which requires semi-annual monitoring for cyanide.

In addition, the MarBorg file only contained analysis for metals once in 2017, occurring in the fourth quarter sampling results. The MarBorg permit specifies the required monitoring frequency as semiannually.

Regulatory Requirements

The federal regulations at 40 CFR 403.8(f)(2)(v) requires the control authority to randomly sample and analyze the effluent from SIUs to identify, independently of information supplied by the SIUs, noncompliance with pretreatment standards.

Requirement 9

The City is required to monitor for all regulated pollutants during compliance sampling events at the frequencies specified in the federal regulations for CIUs and the City's approved pretreatment program for noncategorical SIUs.

2. Has the CA used proper sampling and analysis procedures (40 CFR Part 136) and inspection procedures? Were the procedures done with sufficient care to produce evidence admissible in enforcement proceedings or in judicial actions?
(40 CFR 403.8(f)(2)(v) and (vii), 40 CFR 403.12(g)(5))

Yes. Based on the files reviewed, the City has used proper sampling and analysis procedures, pursuant to 40 CFR Part 136.

3. Has the CA kept records for three years including the following?

- a. Period compliance reports and other reports/notices**
- b. All monitoring records including: sample date, place, method, time, personnel; analysis date, personnel, method; results**
- c. BMP compliance documentation**
- d. Other monitoring records**
(40 CFR 403.12(o))

Based on the files reviewed, the City maintains records for at least three years.

4. Has the CA evaluated, at least once per year, whether NSCIUs continue to meet the criteria of an NSCIU?

(40 CFR 403.8(f)(2)(v)(b), 403.3(v)(2))

N/A. The City has not permitted nondomestic dischargers as NSCIUs nor has it adopted the legal authority to do so.

5. Has the CA required, received, and analyzed reports and other notices from SIUs?

- a. Self-monitoring reports**
- b. BMRs and 90-day compliance reports**
- c. Compliance schedules reports**
- d. Notice of slug loading or potential problems at POTW**
- e. Notification of spills, bypasses, upsets, etc.**
- f. Notification of significant change in discharge**
- g. 24-hour notification of effluent violation**
- h. Resampling results within 30-days**
- i. Other reports/notifications required by the CA**
(40 CFR 403.8(f)(2)(iv))

Based on the files reviewed during the inspection, the City has been requiring, receiving, and analyzing reports. However, the following findings were identified regarding the analysis of required reports.

As mentioned in Finding F.1. below, MarBorg failed to notify the City within 24 hours of becoming aware of flow violations that occurred on April 5 and 6, 2017. In addition, as described in Finding F.2, Corning submitted a self-monitoring report which was signed by the industry representative in June 2017; however, the report was stamped as received by the City in November 2017.

6. Have SIUs monitored to demonstrate continued compliance and re-sampled after violation(s)?

(40 CFR 403.12(g)(1) &(2))

Yes, the SIUs have monitored to demonstrate continued compliance with pretreatment standards. The City monitors in lieu of requiring self-monitoring, with the exception that the City requires Mission Linen #1 and #4 to report continuous pH monitoring and requires MarBorg to report continuous pH monitoring as well as flow.

<p>7. Has the CA ensured CIUs report on all regulated pollutants at least once every 6 months? (40 CFR 403.12(e)(1) & (g)(1))</p> <p>N/A. For the CIU file reviewed during the PCI, the City is monitoring in lieu of requiring self-monitoring.</p>
<p>8. Has the CA ensured non-categorical SIUs self-monitor and report at least once every 6 months with a description of the nature, concentration, and flow of the pollutants required to be reported by the Control Authority? (40 CFR 403.12(h) & (g)(1))</p> <p>Yes. The City is monitoring in lieu of requiring self-monitoring for MarBorg, the noncategorical SIU file reviewed. However, the City requires MarBorg to submit monthly flow and pH monitoring data.</p>
<p>9. Has the CA required self-monitoring reports from CIUs to be signed and certified? (40 CFR 403.12(b)(6), 403.12(l))</p> <p>N/A. For the CIU file reviewed during the PCI, the City is monitoring in lieu of requiring self-monitoring.</p>
<p>10. Has the CA received notification of hazardous waste discharges? (40 CFR 403.12(j) & (p))</p> <p>Based on the SIU files reviewed during the inspection, no hazardous waste discharge notifications were received, nor was there an indication that such notifications should have been received.</p>
<p>F. Enforcement</p>
<p>1. Has the CA implemented its enforcement response plan (ERP)? (40 CFR 403.8(f)(5))</p> <p>No.</p> <p><u>Finding F.1.a– The City did not take enforcement action for failure of an SIU to notify the City with 24 hours of becoming aware of a violation.</u></p> <p>Based on the MarBorg file reviewed, MarBorg notified the City on May 2, 2017 of flow limit exceedances that occurred in April 2017. The City issued a notice of violation (NOV) to MarBorg on May 3, 2017 for the effluent flow that exceeded the limit of 26,000 gallons per day on April 5 and 6, 2017. However, the City did not issue a NOV to MarBorg for failure to notify the City within 24 hours of becoming aware of flow violations that occurred on April 5 and 6, 2017.</p> <p><u>Regulatory Requirement</u></p> <p>The federal regulations at 40 CFR 403.8(f)(5) requires the POTW implement an enforcement response plan.</p>

The federal regulations at 40 CFR 403.12(g)(2) require SIUs to notify the control authority within 24 hours of becoming aware of violations.

Requirement 10

The City is required to take enforcement action according to its ERP. The City should have issued MarBorg a NOV for failure to notify the City within 24 hours of becoming aware of the violation. Following the PCI, the City representatives provided the Inspection Team with a copy of the NOV that was sent to MarBorg on December 12, 2017, for failure to notify the City of these flow violations.

Finding F.1.b– The City did not take enforcement action for late reporting.

The Corning file included a self-monitoring report signed by the industry representative in June 2017; however, the report was stamped as received by the City in November 2017. The monitoring periods for Corning are January 1 to June 30 and July 1 to December 31, with reports due on July 30 and January 30 for each period.

Regulatory Requirement

40 CFR 403.8(f)(1) requires the City to implement its legal authority.

The reporting section of the Corning permit requires semi-annual compliance reports to be submitted to the City on July 30 and January 30 for each reporting period.

The federal regulations at 40 CFR 403.8(f)(5) requires the POTW to develop and implement an enforcement response plan.

Requirement 11

The City is required to issue an NOV to Corning for late reporting. This self-monitoring report was received by the City more than 45 days after the due date of July 30, 2017 and therefore Corning would be in significant noncompliance (SNC) for late reporting.

2. Does the CA evaluate both numeric and narrative criteria for significant non-compliance (SNC) and annually publish a list of IUs in SNC? (40 CFR 403.8(f)(2)(viii))

Yes. The City evaluates SNC for both numeric and narrative criteria, using the federal definition of SNC. The City annually publishes SIUs in SNC in the *Santa Barbara News Press*.

2.a Were any SIUs in SNC in the past year? Include name of industry, type of SNC, and current compliance status.

Three SIUs (MarBorg, South Coast Property Company, and Mission Linen #1) were in SNC for discharge violations in 2017. At the time of the PCI, all SIUs had returned to compliance.

Based on the file review, Corning should have been in SNC in 2017 for late reporting, as describing in Finding F.1.b, above. The City is reminded that all SIUs in SNC are required to be published in the newspaper.

<p>3. Has the CA developed IU compliance schedules? (40 CFR 403.8(f)(1)(iv)(A))</p> <p>No. According to the City representatives, the City has not had to issue a compliance schedule to SIUs.</p>
<p>4. Has the CA ensured CIU compliance within 3 years of standards effective date (or less than 3 years where required by standard)? (40 CFR 403.6(b))</p> <p>N/A. No new CIU regulations have been promulgated in the last three years.</p>
<p>5. Has the CA ensured CIUs submit complete baseline monitoring reports and 90-day compliance reports within the required time frames? (40 CFR 403.12(b) & (d))</p> <p>Based on the CIU file reviewed during the PCI, the City does not maintain the baseline monitoring reports in the CIU's current file.</p>
<p>G. Additional Evaluations</p> <p>None.</p>

Focus Topics

As a component of the inspection, the Inspection Team discussed the following focus topics with the City representatives.

Dental Mercury

The City has 213 licensed dentists in 124 dental offices within its service area. The City sent out a survey to dental facilities and received responses from approximately 60 percent of those surveyed. Of those that responded, only two facilities had amalgam separators. The City has prepared a one-time certification form and has received one certification report from a dental office.

Industrial Laundries

The City has three industrial laundries (Mission Linen #1, Mission Linen #4, and South Coast Property Company). According to the City representatives, the City has discussed the use of nonylphenol ethoxylates with the existing industrial laundries.

Fats, Oils, and Grease (FOG)

The City has 465 food service establishments (FSEs) in its service area. The City does not permit FSEs, inspects them every other year. The FSEs are also required to submit manifests to the City, documenting that they are maintaining their grease removal devices. The City's SUO contains grease trap requirements for FSEs. Since the 2014 PCI, the City has experienced seven sanitary sewer overflows which were attributed to discharges from FSEs.

MarBorg collects FOG-waste from restaurants in the area and is allowed to deliver this waste to the WWTP. MarBorg brings this waste directly to the digester at the WWTP, which converts the waste to gas, generating approximately 60 percent of the required energy for the WWTP. This program has been in place in for two years. The City would like to eventually accept food scrap wastes at the digester, but this would require an additional upgrade to the WWTP.

Attachment A

Industrial User Site Visit Data Sheets

B-[PAGE * MERGEFORMAT]

SITE VISIT DATA SHEET

INSTRUCTIONS: Record observations made during the IU site visit. Provide as much detail as possible.					
Name of industry: Corning Technology Center – Santa Barbara					
Address of industry: 320 Nopal Street, Santa Barbara, CA 93103					
Date of visit: 12/6/2017			Time of visit: 3:30 PM – 4:00 PM		
Name of inspector(s): Gaylen Fair and Mary Thompson, City of Santa Barbara Chuck Durham and Sirese Jacobson, PG Environmental					
Provide the name(s) and title(s) of industry representative(s)					
Name		Title		Phone/Email	
Carl Decker		Facilities Manager		805-729-7940	
IU Permit Number: 17-082N		Exp. Date: June 22, 2017		IU Classification: 40 CFR 469.18 and 433.17 (Refer to note 1 in the Notes section)	
Please provide the following documentation:					
1. Nature of operation: The facility manufactures microfluidics, microelectromechanical systems (MEMS), and 3-dimensional microstructures.					
2. Number of employees	100	Number of shifts:	1	Hours of operation:	5:00 AM – 6:30 PM, Monday - Friday
3. Wastestream flow(s) discharged to the POTW: Wastewater generated at the facility consists of rinse water from each of the individual stations in the WET lab. The facility discharges pretreated wastewater to the POTW in 135-gallon batches approximately ten times per day.					
Sanitary:	Not Reviewed (N/R)	Process:	1,350 (gpd)	Combined:	N/R
4. Describe any current or planned significant changes in process or flow: The number of employees has increased since the last inspection of the facility; however, according to facility representatives, process flow will decrease as operations are moved to the Corning's Goleta site.					
5. Type of pretreatment system (Describe treatment processes, condition of systems, and deficiencies observed): The facility's pretreatment system consists of a 250-gallon pH neutralization system using muriatic acid and potassium hydroxide. The facility batch discharges 135 gallons per discharge.					
Continuous flow		X	Batch (12-15 per day)		Combined
6. Process area description (identify raw materials and processes used): The facility has four clean rooms (one "yellow" room for photo-resistant processes and three "white" rooms). The WET labs have multiple stations for microfabrication processes that include grinding, polishing, and etching of glass and ceramic wafers.					
7. Chemical storage area (identify the chemicals that are maintained on-site, housekeeping, and storage): The facility stores chemicals in the etching lab; the drain in this lab directs flow to the pretreatment system. The facility also stores caustic onsite.					
Any floor drains?		Yes, all floor drains go to the pretreatment system.		Any spill control measures? No	
8. Are hazardous wastes drummed and labeled? The Inspection Team did not observe any hazardous waste drums.					
9. Does the IU have hazardous waste manifests? The City representatives requested that the facility send them					

hazardous waste manifests.
10. Solid waste production and disposal: Solvent-contaminated rags are hauled offsite by ACTenviro.
11. Description of sample location and methods: Sampling point 001 consists of two PVC pipes (one pipe carries process wastewater; one pipe carries cooling water). Samples are collected as grab samples. Sampling point 002 is located at a manhole in the facility's parking lot.
Notes:
1. The City currently has Corning permitted as a CIU subject to the categorical pretreatment regulations at both 40 CFR 469.18 and 433.17; however, based on the processes observed at the facility and the language found in the federal regulations at 40 CFR 433.10, only the categorical pretreatment regulations at 40 CFR 469.18 apply to this facility.

SITE VISIT DATA SHEET

INSTRUCTIONS: Record observations made during the IU site visit. Provide as much detail as possible.					
Name of industry: MarBorg Industries					
Address of industry: 23 N. Quarantina Street, Santa Barbara, CA 93103					
Date of visit: 12/6/2017			Time of visit: 2:50 PM – 3:25 PM		
Name of inspector(s): Gaylen Fair and Mary Thompson, City of Santa Barbara Chuck Durham and Sirese Jacobson, PG Environmental					
Provide the name(s) and title(s) of industry representative(s)					
Name		Title		Phone/Email	
Don Roberson		Consultant		949-279-1797; drrobie44@gmail.com	
IU Permit Number: 14-045N		Exp. Date: 05/31/2019		IU Classification: Non-categorical SIU	
Please provide the following documentation:					
1. Nature of operation: The facility accepts septage and portable toilet waste. Solids are removed from the waste and disposed of offsite.					
2. Number of employees	50	Number of shifts:	1	Hours of operation:	6:30 AM – 5:30 PM
3. Wastestream flow(s) discharged to the POTW: The facility accepts and treats domestic waste from hospitals, schools, and residential sources, which is then discharged to the POTW.					
Sanitary:	(N/R)	Process:	486,362 gallons per month (discharged in October 2017)	Combined:	N/R
4. Describe any current or planned significant changes in process or flow: According to the facility representative, there are no current or planned changes in the process or flow.					
5. Type of pretreatment system (Describe treatment processes, condition of systems, and deficiencies observed): The facility's pretreatment system consists of grinding, washing, and screening of domestic waste. Septage and chemical toilet waste are pumped through a Muffin Monster which grinds the solids, and then captures solids in a perforated screening trough. Solids are washed and removed by an auger. The remaining waste is discharged to the WWTP.					
Continuous flow		X	Batch		Combined
6. Process area description (identify raw materials and processes used): The facility receives approximately 20 truckloads of domestic sewage and chemical toilet waste per day. The trucks arrive, scan their card at the programmable logic controller. The facility employees connect a hose from the trucks at one of the two loading bays to a receiving pit. The septage is then pumped through a Muffin Monster [®] grinder/separator unit for solids removal as described above (this unit has been in place since 2006). Waste is then discharged to the WWTP.					
7. Chemical storage area (identify the chemicals that are maintained on-site, housekeeping, and storage): The facility does not store any chemicals onsite.					
Any floor drains?		N/A		Any spill control measures?	
				No	
8. Are hazardous wastes drummed and labeled? The facility does not generate hazardous waste.					
9. Does the IU have hazardous waste manifests? N/A					

10. Solid waste production and disposal: The facility takes the screenings (e.g., sewage rags and plastics) from the auger to the Tajiguas Landfill in Santa Barbara, CA.

11. Description of sample location and methods: Samples are collected from a receiving pit.

Notes:

The facility has 20 trucks in its own fleet and three private trucks that are allowed to discharge to the facility's system.

MarBorg also accepts FOG waste at the facility which is stored in a 14,000-gallon tank. Two grease-only trucks haul FOG waste to the facility one to two times per week.

Attachment C

Example PCA report